

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

Mar

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/981,253	10/18/2001	Takefumi Nagata	Q66677	5979
	7590 10/30/200 ION, ZINN, MACPEA	EXAMINER		
2100 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.			DANG, DUY M	
Washington, DC 20037-3202		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			2624	
				<b>_</b>
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			10/30/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
09/981,253	NAGATA ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
Duy M. Dang	2624	•

	Duy M. Dang	2624
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the	correspondence address
THE REPLY FILED 15 October 2007 FAILS TO PLACE THIS A	PPLICATION IN CONDITION FO	R ALLOWANCE.
1.  The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a No a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance time periods:	the same day as filing a Notice of ving replies: (1) an amendment, af tice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in	Appeal. To avoid abandonment of fidavit, or other evidence, which compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3)
a) The period for reply expires 4 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire to Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL BE JECTION. See MONTHS OF	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailir b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN TH	ng date of the final rejection.
TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 70 Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL	on which the petition under 37 CFR 1. tension and the corresponding amount thortened statutory period for reply orion than three months after the mailing date.	t of the fee. The appropriate extension fee anially set in the final Office action: or (2) as
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any external Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed AMENDMENTS	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	o avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since
<ol> <li>The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, [a]</li> <li>They raise new issues that would require further condition (b)</li> <li>They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below)</li> <li>They are not deemed to place the application in bet appeal; and/or</li> <li>They present additional claims without canceling a conditional claims.</li> </ol>	nsideration and/or search (see NC w); ter form for appeal by materially re	TE below); educing or simplifying the issues for
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).  4.  The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12.  5.  Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s).  6.  Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be al non-allowable claim(s).	:	
7.  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: <u>11 and 12</u> . Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-10</u> . Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:	☑ will not be entered, or b) ☑ w vided below or appended.	ill be entered and an explanation of
<ul> <li>AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE</li> <li>8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ul>	t before or on the date of filing a N d sufficient reasons why the affida	lotice of Appeal will <u>not</u> be entered vit or other evidence is necessary and
9.  The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome all rejections under appe	eal and/or appellant fails to provide a
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER		
11.   The request for reconsideration has been considered bu  See attached.		in condition for allowance because:
<ul><li>12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).</li><li>13. ☐ Other:</li></ul>	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)	
		/Duy M. Dang/ Primary Examiner AU2624

Art Unit: 2624

## Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed 10/15/07 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., "the density is determined...the object" at page 2 last two lines; and "the density does not have the information of the spatial frequency" at page 3 line 1) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See In re Van Geuns, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993). In this case, claimed "high density range" is defined as "lung areas" and "low density range" is defined as "mediastinum" according to Applicant's disclosed specification page 2 lines 1-3. In response to this, figure 19 in Nakazawa illustrates these claimed features. Specifically, "high transmission ratio" is a mediastinum and therefore refers to claimed "low density range", and "low transmission ratio" areas are lung areas and therefore refer to claimed "high density range". The digitization representation of the tomographic image comprises low and high frequency components in which low frequency components represent high density range or lung area and high frequency components represent low density range or mediastinum area. Applicant is reminded that the examiner is entitled to give the broadest reasonable interpretation to the language of the claims. The examiner is not limited to applicant's definition which is not specifically set forth in the claims. In re Tanaka et al., 193 USPQ, (CCPA) 1977.

In response to Applicant's argument set forth at page 3 first full paragraph that states "The examiner cites...claim 1 is patentable over Nakazawa for this reason", The examiner

Art Unit: 2624

respectively disagrees. First, claim 1 merely recites "carrying out dynamic range compression processing on the image data so as to compress a high density range of the chest tomographic image, wherein the chest tomographic image includes a low density range that is uneffected by the compression of the high density range". At column 12 lines 21-35, Nakazawa teaches compressing dynamic range by the use of unsharpness mask signal. To do so, Nakazawa teaches obtaining unsharpness mask signals corresponding to components of ultra low spatial frequency of the images signals of an original and a total dynamic range can be compressed by this processing without any action on the contrast of signal corresponding to the detailed structures. This provides that Nakazawa's contrast portion or high frequency or claimed "low density range" is uneffected when applying unsharpness mask processing and Nakazawa dynamic range is compressed. The total dynamic range is compressed in Nakazawa due to the dynamic range of the low frequency or high density portion in Nakazawa is compressed by unsharpness mask process. This means Nakazawa obtain total dynamic range compressed by compressing low frequency or high density portion by using unsharpness mask processing.

2. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Duy M. Dang whose telephone number is 571-272-7389. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday from 6:00AM to 2:30PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Eileen D. Lillis can be reached on 571-272-6928. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 09/981,253

Art Unit: 2624

Page 4

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <a href="http://pair-direct.uspto.gov">http://pair-direct.uspto.gov</a>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

dmd 10/07 DUY M. DANG
PRIMARY EXAMINER